

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 203

July 24, 1997, 4:15 pm
Page S-8039 Temp. Record

COMMERCE-JUSTICE-STATE/National Endowment for Democracy

SUBJECT: Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1998 . . . S. 1022. Stevens motion to table the Lugar amendment No. 984.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE FAILED, 27-72

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1022, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1998, will provide a total of \$31.624 billion in new budget authority, which is \$1.394 billion more than appropriated for fiscal year (FY) 1997 and is \$4.022 billion less than requested. The President's request was so high primarily because he proposed more than doubling the amount for Commerce and Related Agencies in order to fund a proposed \$3.5 billion capital acquisitions account for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

The Lugar amendment would appropriate \$30 million for the National Endowment for Democracy (NED; the bill will not appropriate any money for the NED). It would offset the cost by reducing the State Department Capital Investment Fund by \$30 million (the bill will provide \$11 million more than requested for that fund).

During debate, Senator Stevens moved to table the Lugar amendment. A motion to table is not debatable; however, some debate preceded the making of the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

NOTE: After the vote, a pending McConnell amendment, and then the Lugar amendment, were adopted by voice votes. The McConnell amendment struck all after the first word and substituted language with the same effect.

Those favoring the motion to table contended:

Argument 1:

The NED is a Cold-War relic that was never of any use in the Cold War and that is particularly inexcusable today. Its main

(See other side)

YEAS (27)		NAYS (72)				NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (13 or 24%)	Democrats (14 or 32%)	Republicans (42 or 76%)		Democrats (30 or 68%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Allard	Baucus	Abraham	Hutchinson	Akaka	Lautenberg		Kennedy- ^{2AN}
Cochran	Bingaman	Ashcroft	Hutchison	Biden	Leahy		
D'Amato	Boxer	Bennett	Inhofe	Bryan	Levin		
Faircloth	Breaux	Bond	Jeffords	Daschle	Lieberman		
Grassley	Bumpers	Brownback	Kempthorne	Dodd	Mikulski		
Gregg	Byrd	Burns	Kyl	Durbin	Moseley-Braun		
Helms	Cleland	Campbell	Lugar	Feinstein	Moynihan		
Lott	Conrad	Chafee	Mack	Glenn	Murray		
Nickles	Dorgan	Coats	McCain	Graham	Reed		
Shelby	Feingold	Collins	McConnell	Harkin	Reid		
Stevens	Ford	Coverdell	Murkowski	Inouye	Robb		
Thompson	Hollings	Craig	Roberts	Johnson	Rockefeller		
Warner	Kohl	DeWine	Roth	Kerrey	Sarbanes		
	Wyden	Domenici	Santorum	Kerry	Torricelli		
		Enzi	Sessions	Landrieu	Wellstone		
		Frist	Smith, Bob				
		Gorton	Smith, Gordon				
		Gramm	Snowe				
		Grams	Specter				
		Hagel	Thomas				
		Hatch	Thurmond				
						EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:	
						1—Official Business	
						2—Necessarily Absent	
						3—Illness	
						4—Other	
						SYMBOLS:	
						AY—Announced Yea	
						AN—Announced Nay	
						PY—Paired Yea	
						PN—Paired Nay	

Compiled and written by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee—Larry E. Craig, Chairman

function is to serve as a free tourism agency for the politically-connected in Washington, D.C. From its inception, it has been required to turn over most of its money to front organizations for four groups: the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Chamber of Commerce; and the AFL-CIO. Those groups use the money mostly to hold conferences in exotic locales, where they tell the natives all about the joys of democracy, political organizing, and the like. We are not necessarily against the United States being involved in promoting democracy. For instance, we note that the Agency for International Development gets \$4 billion per year and it spends \$400 million of that amount on democracy-building projects. We also note that the United States spends \$13 billion to \$14 billion per year on foreign aid, and \$1 billion on foreign food assistance, and all of that money fosters a desire in other countries to be a democracy like the United States. On top of all this spending, the extra \$30 million for the NED is a worthless, and wasteful, drop in the bucket. We also oppose the funding source this amendment would use. It would take \$30 million out of the State Department's Capital Investment Fund. This bill has a large increase for that fund because it is greatly needed. The State Department reports that it cannot effectively communicate with its people in the field because 82 percent of its radio equipment, 55 percent of its computer equipment, and 40 percent of its telephone equipment is obsolete. Average Americans like to go on trips too. When they go, they pay. They do not belong to the exclusive club of politicians, business tycoons, and labor leaders that get trips for free as long as they schedule a couple of meetings about democracy. It is time to end this outrage. We urge our colleagues to join us in pulling the plug on Club NED.

Argument 2:

The NED is a worthwhile program that should be funded, we have always supported funding for it in the past, and we will support funding in the future. However, that does not mean the Senate needs to debate this amendment all day. The House has already included \$30 million for the NED, and when the bill goes to conference the Senate can just accede to the House's position. After numerous debates over the years, everyone is well aware that a majority of Senators favor appropriations for this program; we ought to just table this amendment now and get on with the consideration of the bill.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

In 1983, Congress enacted President Reagan's proposal to create the National Endowment for Democracy. The NED is vintage President Reagan: it operates at an incredibly minor cost for a Federal agency; it has very little bureaucratic red tape; and it focuses on practical, grassroots solutions to problems. The NED can solve in days for little or no money what would, by law and regulation, require years of effort by the State Department. The NED and its core grantees work citizen by citizen and community by community to transform individual aspirations of self-determination into democracies, that, in the words of Ronald Reagan, preserve and protect individual liberty, representative government, and the rule of law under God.

The excuse given for eliminating the NED is that it is a Cold-War relic. The assumption on which that excuse is based, that this program was made just to respond to communism, is false. It was created to fight authoritarianism everywhere. We remind our colleagues that in the 1980s most of the NED's efforts were concentrated in Latin America, and during the Reagan and Bush presidencies all of Latin America became free (with the exception of Cuba). It is certainly true that the NED was very instrumental in helping Solidarity in Poland, Václav Havel in Czechoslovakia, and numerous other leaders behind the Iron Curtain end Soviet rule, but that was not and is not the sole purpose of the NED. Further, many of those countries are still unstable and need help to maintain and expand democratic institutions. Areas in which the NED is currently active include China, Burma, and Cuba. Senators do not need to take our word on the value of this program; they need only listen to virtually every leader of every pro-democracy movement around the world. Leaders in Eastern Europe have praised the NED; Aung San Suu, the deposed President of Burma, supports the NED's efforts to depose Burma's military junta; Harry Wu, the Chinese dissident who monitors prison labor in China with help from the NED, supports this program's continuation; and Martin Lee, the Hong Kong pro-democracy leader, has urged Congress not to eliminate funding for the NED.

The main criticism of this program is that a large portion of the funding goes to politically powerful people. This fact has led some of our colleagues to conclude that the NED is really some sort of travel club for the politically connected. The only evidence they have is that these officials fly to the countries that they help, but that is pretty slim evidence. In most cases, these people have the means to travel anywhere they please when they want to go on vacations (if they are able to find the time for vacations).

Some of us have been strong supporters of the NED since its creation in the 1980s. Others of us have been converted by its successes. We are unanimous in believing that it is one of the most cost-effective, if not the most cost-effective, program ever created to advance the United States', and humanity's, interests in the world. Eliminating the NED would cause tremendous harm to the United States and immense, unnecessary suffering around the world. We therefore strongly oppose the motion to table the Lugar amendment.